

Appln. No. 09/993,251

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1161

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-20 are rejected and pending. Responsive to the Office Action mailed September 24, 2003, claims 1, 9, and 16 have been amended and claim 5, 12, and 18 have been cancelled. With the amendment provided above and the remarks provided below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and a withdrawal of all objections and rejections.

Responsive to the rejections of independent claims 1, 9, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 2000317533, the cited reference fails to teach each and every element as set forth in the invention as now claimed. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Amended independent claims 1, 9, and 16 recite that moving the roller in a transverse direction with respect to the central includes "dividing the end portion into multiple imaginary planes perpendicular to the central axis, forming a contour corresponding to the multiple imaginary planes, and programming the roller to follow the contour." Clearly, the cited reference JP 2000317533 fails to teach such limitations as claimed in the present application. Thus, the rejections of claims 1, 9, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 4, 6, and 7 are dependent claims which generally depend from claim 1; claims 11-14 are dependent claims which generally depend from claim 9; and claim 17 depends from claim 16. Thus, the rejections of claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 11-14, and 17 should be withdrawn.

Responsive to the rejections of claims 5, 12, and 18 (now cancelled) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000317533 and *Masseø*, the combination fails to teach or suggest all the elements of amended claims 1, 9, and 16. Claims 1, 9, and 16 have been amended to recited limitations of dependent claims 5, 12, and 18 (now cancelled), respectively. As provided above, amended claims 1, 9, and 16 now recite that moving the roller in a transverse direction with respect to the central axis includes "dividing the end portion into multiple imaginary

-6-

The logo for the law firm Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione, consisting of the firm's name stacked vertically in a rectangular box.

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
PO Box 10395  
Chicago, IL 60611-5599

Appln. No. 09/993,251

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1161

planes perpendicular to the central axis, forming a contour corresponding to the multiple imaginary planes, and programming the roller to follow the contour." The combination fails to teach or suggest all the elements of amended claims 1, 9, and 16. For example, *Massee* simply teaches that measuring data corresponds to the position of the piston rod 11 relative to the upper bed 7. *Massee*, col. 3, lines 60-62; see also Fig. 2. Moreover, the control unit 20 controls the movement of the roller 4 by using the position values derived from the measuring data, in which the spring means is made inoperative. *Massee*, col. 4, lines 5-11; see also Fig. 2. Neither of the references nor the combination thereof teaches or suggests dividing the end portion into multiple imaginary planes, forming a contour corresponding to the planes; and programming accordingly as recited in amended claims 1, 9, and 16. Therefore, claims 1, 9, and 16 are allowable.

Dependent claims 13 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000317533 in view of *Irie* U.S. Patent No. 6,067,833 (*Irie* '833). Claim 13 is dependent on independent claim 9 and claim 19 is dependent on independent claim 16. For the reasons set forth above, the rejections of claims 13 and 19 should be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 15, and 20 depend from claims 1, 9, and 16, respectively and should be allowed for the reasons provided above. It is to be noted that the Office Action mailed September 24, 2003 was unresponsive to Applicants' remarks of claims 8, 15, and 20 in Applicants' reply dated August 28, 2003. The Office Action mailed September 24, 2003 neither repeats grounds of rejection nor states the reasons in support thereof as required by Rule 1.113(b).

Thus, claims 1, 3-4, 6-9, 11, 13-17, and 19-20 are in a condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

-7-



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
PO Box 10395  
Chicago, IL 60611-5599

Appln. No. 09/993,251

Attorney Docket No. 10541-1161

Applicant has calculated no fees to be presently due in connection with the filing of this Paper. However, Applicant has authorized charging of any fee deficiency to the deposit account of Applicant's assignee, Visteon Global Technologies, Inc., as indicated in the Transmittal accompanying this Statement.

Respectfully submitted,

December 24, 2003

Date



Lawrence G. Almeda (Reg. No. 46,151)

☒ Attorney Of Record☐ 37 C.F.R. 1.34(a)

-8-



BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
PO Box 10395  
Chicago, IL 60611-5599